

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 93 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #333
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 13 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 333

Today's Topics:

 Aspiring hams: We're not this bad!
 No Frills License Application (8 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 11 Sep 1993 15:53:16 GMT
From: mentor.cc.purdue.edu!sage.cc.purdue.edu!blumb@purdue.edu
Subject: Aspiring hams: We're not this bad!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin.jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:
>A lot of bashing occurs in this area against the TECHNICIAN class
>license holder and against those who would like to see the end of
>the Morse code requirement. To be fair, many have also attacked
>those who prefer to operate CW.

I posted an article stating that I was pursuing a no-code tech class
license... I received approx. 20 pieces of mail regarding the post. 9 were
"Welcome to ham radio, hope you upgrade." The remaining 11 were just
flaming me for even Considering Going Codeless.

>There have been people on both sides of the issue who have presented
>interesting and thought-provoking arguments. There have also been a
>few who come across as complete jerks and who would probably get
>their intellectual butts kicked by a 3rd-string member of the
>high-school debate team! ;-)

I was the captain of my high school speech/debate team. :)

--

Bill Blum blumb@sage.cc.purdue.edu Purdue University, W. Lafayette, IN

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 93 03:32:30 CDT
From: library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!
swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> Naturally, you would only have to pay the \$100 if you were an
> european-decendent white male, since, as everyone knows, they are
> the source of all evil in the world today... The rest would just
> have to mail it in without the fee.

Isn't THAT the truth! And rioting, raping, and robbing in Los Angeles
is JUST an expression of their First Amendment rights. Why do I get
this vision of a band of Codeless Technicians marching down Main Street,
shouting "No justice, no peace!" When do we draw the line?

--Robert

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 93 03:38:12 CDT
From: library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!
swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gsmlrn@gsm001.mendelson.com (Geoffrey S. Mendelson) writes:

>
> The N30WJ addendum for Amateur Extra Class
>
> I wish to have an Amateur Extra license. I am enclosing receipts for the
> retail purchase of the following equipment:
>
> 1. A Japanese HF transciever costing at least three thousand US dollars.
>
> 2. A morse code key (straight, imabic or "bug").

>
> 3. A set of morse code instruction tapes and an appropriate tape player.
>
> 4. An electronic keyer with memory.
>
> By signing below, you indicate that you have purchased these items
> retail, in NEW condition. They have never been used or sold previously.
> you also agree to not sell, lend or in any way transfer these items for
> a minimum of 10 (ten) years without purchasing NEW equipment for at
> least 50 (fifteen) percent more than the cost of these items.
>
> You also agree that you will not use the frequency allocations of your
> Amateur Extra class license until you have successfully programmed your keyer
> to send the following phrase:
>
> "CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST DE <your callsign> K"
>
>
> Signature: _____ Date: _____
>
>
>
> -----
>
>
> 73,
>
> Geoff.
> --
> Geoffrey S. Mendelson N3OWJ
> (215) 242-8712
> gsm@mendelson.com or uunet!gsm001!gsm

Then what? When someone answers (in CW), how will you read the message?

--Robert

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 1993 02:49:28 GMT
From: gsm001!gsm001.mendelson.com!gsmlrn@uunet.uu.net
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <26sd6s\$cgd@chnews.intel.com> jlbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

>
>

> The
> W5GYJ
> No-Code, No-Theory, No-Regulations
> Amateur Radio License Application Form
>
>This is an application for a station license in the Amateur Radio
>Service. It requires a truthful answer to a single question. Giving
>a false or misleading answer to this question is perjury. By
>signing below, you certify that you are aware of the legal penalties
>for perjury.
>
>Signature: _____ Date:_____
>
>Operation in the Amateur Radio Service is governed by Part 97 of
>the Rules and Regulations of the Federal Communications Commission.
>By signing below, you indicate that you have read and understand
>the provisions of Part 97 and agree to abide by them.
>
>Signature: _____ Date:_____
>
>Costs for the administration of the Amateur Radio Service are defrayed
>in part by licensing fees. The fee for a station license is \$100
>per year. Please enclose \$100 with your application for the first
>year's fee.

The N3OWJ addendum for Amateur Extra Class

I wish to have an Amateur Extra license. I am enclosing receipts for the retail purchase of the following equipment:

1. A Japanese HF transciever costing at least three thousand US dollars.
2. A morse code key (straight, imabic or "bug").
3. A set of morse code instruction tapes and an appropriate tape player.
4. An electronic keyer with memory.

By signing below, you indicate that you have purchased these items retail, in NEW condition. They have never been used or sold previously. you also agree to not sell, lend or in any way transfer these items for a minimum of 10 (ten) years without purchasing NEW equipment for at least 50 (fifteen) percent more than the cost of these items.

You also agree that you will not use the frequency allocations of your Amateur Extra class license until you have successfully programed your keyer to send the following phrase:

"CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST DE <your callsign> K"

Signature: _____ Date: _____

73,

Geoff.

--

Geoffrey S. Mendelson N3OWJ

(215) 242-8712

gsm@mendelson.com or uunet!gsm001!gsm

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 1993 15:05:40 GMT

From: gsm001!gsm001.mendelson.com!gsmlrn@uunet.uu.net

Subject: No Frills License Application

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I wrote:

>> You also agree that you will not use the frequency allocations of your
>> Amateur Extra class license until you have successfully programed your keyer
>> to send the following phrase:

>>

>> "CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST DE <your callsign> K"

>>

In article <Du0q0B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>Then what? When someone answers (in CW), how will you read the message?

Why, do think they do now? :-)

IMHO if you want a challenge try 2 meter ssb contesting. It's like a
maytag repairman's* calls per month contest.

Try tuning your rig to 144.200 usb and calling CQ. There are times that I need
to call other hams on the phone to arrange contacts and I live in a realtively

populous area. (Philadelphia, PA).

* Maytag used to have a tv commercial that claimed a maytag repair man was the lonlyest gut in town. Noone ever called him.

--

Geoffrey S. Mendelson N30WJ
(215) 242-8712
gsm@mendelson.com or uunet!gsm001!gsm

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 1993 18:04:45 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Du0q0B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>> You also agree that you will not use the frequency allocations of your
>> Amateur Extra class license until you have successfully programed your keyer
>> to send the following phrase:

>>

>> "CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST DE <your callsign> K"

>

>Then what? When someone answers (in CW), how will you read the message?

You don't. You send the automatic signal again and again like any real Extra. You never listen. :-)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

Date: 13 Sep 1993 01:54:04 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> I post:

>> The
>> W5GYJ
>> No-Code, No-Theory, No-Regulations
>> Amateur Radio License Application Form

In article <1993Sep11.213510.7965@anomaly.sbs.com>
kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>Naturally, you would only have to pay the \$100 if you were an
>european-decendent white male, since, as everyone knows, they are
>the source of all evil in the world today... The rest would just
>have to mail it in without the fee.

Nah, *everybody* has to pay the \$100/year. It's really a
Revenue Enhancement Mechanism (ie; a *TAX*).

But there could be exceptions. For people with titles like
Reverend, Bishop, etc., the cost could be \$10,000/year.
These guys are the *real* source of all evil in the world
today. ;-)

Jim, W5GYJ

Date: 13 Sep 93 03:39:31 GMT
From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!avdms8.msfc.nasa.gov!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.kei.com!ddsw1!indep1!clifto@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <26sd6s\$cgd@chnews.intel.com> jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley,
W5GYJ) writes:

> The
> W5GYJ
> No-Code, No-Theory, No-Regulations
> Amateur Radio License Application Form

WAAAAAY too much here...

>This is an application for a station license in the Amateur Radio
>Service. It requires a truthful answer to a single question. Giving
>a false or misleading answer to this question is perjury. By
>signing below, you certify that you are aware of the legal penalties
>for perjury.

Why the hell should I have to know non-radio law to operate a radio?

All I wanna do is ratchet-jaw with my good buddies, not chase ambulances.

>Signature: _____ Date:_____

You mean I have to know how to write, too? There's absolutely no place on this form for witnesses to sign after I make my mark.

>Operation in the Amateur Radio Service is governed by Part 97 of
>the Rules and Regulations of the Federal Communications Commission.
>By signing below, you indicate that you have read and understand
>the provisions of Part 97 and agree to abide by them.

Now I have to be able to read, too??? Dammit, I want to talk, not read about talking.

>Signature: _____ Date:_____

More damn writing.

>Costs for the administration of the Amateur Radio Service are defrayed
>in part by licensing fees. The fee for a station license is \$100
>per year. Please enclose \$100 with your application for the first
>year's fee.

Now you're discriminating against me because I'm poor.

No damn credit for the following:

- *I know where the push-to-talk button is
- *I can mount my own mag-mount rubber duckie
- *I know exactly where to go to have my rig peaked and slid

Damn. Every year they make these tests harder and harder. You High And Mighty types want to keep everybody out. Damn elitist snobs.

(Smileys deliberately omitted to provoke the humor-impaired.)

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indepl.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indepl.uucp   |
|    WA9PDM    |                        Use whichever one works          |
+-----+
```

Date: 13 Sep 1993 08:04:23 GMT
From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
soda.berkeley.edu!lee@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Du0q0B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,
 robert <robert@amanda.jpunix.com> wrote:
 >gsm1rn@gsm001.mendelson.com (Geoffrey S. Mendelson) writes:

[much deleted]

```
>> You also agree that you will not use the frequency allocations of your
>> Amateur Extra class license until you have successfully programmed your keyer
>> to send the following phrase:
>>
>> "CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST DE <your callsign> K"
>
>Then what? When someone answers (in CW), how will you read the message?
```

Someone's S(arcasm)-meter is off today.

[illegible]

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 1993 23:55:25 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!bruce.cs.monash.edu.au!trlluna!titan!pcies4.trl.OZ.AU!
drew@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <joer.746497518@zen.DEV.3Com.COM>, <CCG8H1.IGJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1993Sep7.125114.4332@cs.brown.edu>~G

Subject : Re: CW courtesy (was: WAA! WAA! WHY DO I HAVE TO DO THE CODE?!?!?!)

In article <1993Sep7.125114.4332@cs.brown.edu> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael Deignan) writes:

```
>From: md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael Deignan)
>Subject: CW courtesy (was: WAA! WAA! WHY DO I HAVE TO DO THE CODE?!?!?)
>Date: Tue, 7 Sep 1993 12:51:14 GMT
>In article <CCG8H1.IGJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu
>(Jeff Herman) writes:
>
```

>|> But their arguments contain a major flaw: there are no problems in the

>|> CW subbands; there is no intentional interference, no profanity, no
>|> false MAYDAY calls, no one being arrested or fined or having their
>|> license yanked. Any and all problems are on the voice segments.

>

>While I agree that there may be no false MAYDAY calls and no profanity,
>the CW portions of the bands have been, whether intentional or not,
>loaded with interference. It is not at all uncommon for me to be in
>the middle of a QSO and all of a sudden have someone start tuning up
>right over the station I am in contact with. I've even had people
>tune up and start to send CQ without even asking QRL.

>

>Of course, one could say it is propagation, and that the station just
>can't hear the party I'm talking to, so they think its a "clear"
>frequency....

>

>However, common courtesy dictates that one ask if the frequency is in
>use before using it. I can turn on my receiver to any portion of the
>CW bands and, at least several times per night, hear people start
>walking all over one another without the least bit of courtesy.

>

>

>Don't get me wrong - I support the current code requirement; at least,
>until someone wakes up and decides to really put some teeth into the
>theory tests. Of course, that will never happen, since the welfare-
>state mentality of America has decended itself into the ham radio
>community. However, to suggest that CW operators are somehow more
>"gentlemanly" than voice operators, I believe, is a fallacy.

>

>

>MD

>--

>-- Michael P. Deignan

>-- Population Studies & Training Center

>-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912

>-- (401) 863-2668

BTW, whatever happened to I E ? (dit dit dit?) for checking for clear
channel? Rarely heard now. 73 Drew, VK3XU.

Date: 12 Sep 1993 16:35:07 -0700

From: olivea@apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep12.024928.19570@gsm001.mendelson.com>,

<Du0q0B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <1993Sep12.180445.21389@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>

Subject : Re: No Frills License Application

>licensing requirement, but the above argument touched me as being
>absolutely silly. By this argument, if the only mode I am
>interested in is CW, then I should not be required to have any
>questions on my exam about radiotelephone communications, or packet
>operation, or any other mode!!!

>

>The licensing process is meant to test a potential licensee on all
>aspects of amateur radio. CW is an aspect of amateur radio. Live
>with it.

> Donald D. Woelz, K9GR

Office Phone: 414-644-8700

But Donald, the CW testing is the ONLY mode or aspect of amateur
radio that has a total PASS/FAIL aspect to it. I can take the
advanced test (or any other level test) and get every question
wrong related to a particular aspect of amateur radio or a particular
operating mode and still pass the test. That is not the case with
CW. In an earlier post I suggested that the CW questions should
be just added to the question total for whatever test one is taking.
Then, using the same 75% passing requirement, it would be possible
to pass the general test (or the extra) even if someone got all
or almost all of the CW questions wrong. At least in that was,
CW does not become the VETO element that it is today.

Just my .02.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)

Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70

201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #333
